

Jon Niermann, *Chairman*  
Emily Lindley, *Commissioner*  
Bobby Janecka, *Commissioner*  
Erin Chancellor, *Interim Executive Director*



## TEXAS COMMISSION ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

*Protecting Texas by Reducing and Preventing Pollution*

June 2, 2023

Laurie Gharis, Chief Clerk  
Texas Commission on Environmental Quality  
P.O. Box 13087, MC 105  
Austin, Texas 78711-3087

Re: Executive Director's Response to Hearing Requests for MTX Materials, LP;  
Permit No. WQ0005337000; Docket No. 2023-0555-IWD

Dear Ms. Gharis:

Enclosed for filing is the "Executive Director's Response to Hearing Requests." If you have any questions or comments, please call me at (512) 239-5692.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Celia Castro".

Celia Castro  
Staff Attorney  
Environmental Law Division

Enclosure

cc: Mailing List

DOCKET NUMBER 2023-0555-IWD

APPLICATION BY	§	BEFORE THE
MTX MATERIALS, LP	§	TEXAS COMMISSION
FOR	§	ON
PERMIT NO. WQ0005337000	§	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

---

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S RESPONSE TO HEARING REQUESTS

---

**I. Introduction**

The Executive Director (ED) of the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ or Commission) files this Response to Hearing Requests (Response) on the application by MTX Materials, LP (Applicant) for a new Texas Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (TPDES) Permit No. WQ0005337000. Timely hearing requests were received from Cook's Branch Conservancy (CBC).

Attached for Commission consideration is a satellite map of the facility area (Attachment A) and the Landowners' Map and List (Attachment B).

**II. Facility Description**

The Applicant applied for a new TPDES Permit to authorize the discharge of mine dewatering water and stormwater on an intermittent and flow-variable basis via Outfall 001. The Applicant currently operates the MTX 1 Plant, a sand mining facility, located at 19219 Keenan Cut Off Road, south of the City of Montgomery, in Montgomery County, Texas.

According to the application, the process of sand mining at this site does not generate any wastewater, and the draft permit does not authorize the discharge of domestic wastewater. The facility's operations at the site include extracting sand (digging up sand via excavator or backhoe) from an open pit on the property (sand mining) and then selling/distributing this product to customers. Stormwater is the only discharge from the site. When natural precipitation falls within the open pit, it also has the potential to collect. The facility utilizes a diesel-powered pump as necessary to pump out the collected stormwater from the open pit into a retention pond. Stormwater naturally drains from all other areas of the site into the same retention pond. Stormwater may be discharged off-site via Outfall 001 as necessary. All other operations are equipped with control measures (secondary containment/double walled tanks and loading/unloading connects from above-ground storage tanks (ASTs) with drip pans to collect any potential leaks/spills). No water treatment occurs in the facility.

The effluent will be discharged via Outfall 001 to an unnamed tributary, then to an unnamed impoundment, then to an unnamed tributary, then to East Edge Lake, then to an unnamed tributary, then to Lake Creek in Segment No. 1015 of the San Jacinto River Basin. The unclassified receiving water uses are limited aquatic life use for the unnamed tributary, the unnamed impoundment, and East Edge Lake. The designated uses for Segment No. 1015 are primary contact recreation, public water supply, and high aquatic life use. The effluent limitations in the draft permit will maintain and protect the existing instream uses. The 2020 Clean Water Act § 303(d) list, the State's

inventory of impaired and threatened waters, does not currently list Segment No. 1015.

### **III. Procedural Background**

The TCEQ received the application on November 11, 2021, and declared it administratively complete on January 27, 2022. The Applicant published the Notice of Receipt and Intent to Obtain a Water Quality Permit (NORI) in English in the *Conroe Courier* and in Spanish in *La Voz* newspaper on February 16, 2022. The Applicant published a Combined NORI and Notice of Application and Preliminary Decision (NAPD) in English in the *Conroe Courier* and in Spanish in *La Voz* newspaper on May 18, 2022. The combined notice was issued to correct the discharge route described in the NORI. The public comment period ended on June 17, 2022. This application was filed on or after September 1, 2015; therefore, this application is subject to the procedural requirements adopted pursuant to House Bill (HB) 801, 76th Legislature (1999), and Senate Bill (SB) 709, 84th Legislature (2015), which are implemented by the Commission in its rules in 30 TAC Chapters 39, 50, and 55.

### **IV. The Evaluation Process for Hearing Requests**

House Bill 801 established statutory procedures for public participation in certain environmental permitting proceedings, specifically regarding public notice and public comment and the Commission's consideration of hearing requests. Senate Bill 709 revised the requirements for submitting public comment and the Commission's consideration of hearing requests for applications filed on or after September 1, 2015. Because the application in this case was filed on September 11, 2018, it is subject to the House Bill 801 and Senate Bill 709 requirements. The Commission implemented both bills by adopting procedural rules in title 30, chapters 39, 50, and 55 of the Texas Administrative Code. The evaluation process for hearing requests is as follows:

#### **A. Response to Requests**

The Executive Director, the Public Interest Counsel, and the Applicant may each submit written responses to a hearing request. 30 TAC § 55.209(d).

Responses to hearing requests must specifically address:

- 1) whether the requestor is an affected person;
- 2) which issues raised in the hearing request are disputed;
- 3) whether the dispute involves questions of fact or of law;
- 4) whether the issues were raised during the public comment period;
- 5) whether the hearing request is based on issues raised solely in a public comment withdrawn by the commenter in writing by filing a withdrawal letter with the chief clerk prior to the filing of the Executive Director's Response to Comment;
- 6) whether the issues are relevant and material to the decision on the application; and

- 7) a maximum expected duration for the contested case hearing.

30 TAC § 55.209(e).

## **B. Hearing Request Requirements**

In order for the Commission to consider a hearing request, the Commission must first determine whether the request meets certain requirements:

Affected persons may request a contested case hearing. The request must be made in writing and timely filed with the chief clerk. The request must be based only on the requestor's timely comments and may not be based on an issue that was raised solely in a public comment that was withdrawn by the requestor prior to the filing of the Executive Director's Response to Comment, and, for applications filed on or after September 1, 2015, must be based only on the requestor's timely comments.

30 TAC § 55.201(c).

A hearing request must substantially comply with the following:

- 1) give the name, time, address, daytime telephone number, and where possible, fax number of the person who files the request. If the request is made by a group or association, the request must identify one person by name, address, daytime telephone number, and where possible, fax number, who shall be responsible for receiving all official communications and documents for the group;
- 2) identify the person's personal justiciable interest affected by the application, including a brief, but specific, written statement explaining in plain language the requestor's location and distance relative to the proposed facility or activity that is the subject of the application and how and why the requestor believes they will be adversely affected by the proposed facility or activity in a manner not common to members of the general public;
- 3) request a contested case hearing;
- 4) list all relevant and material disputed issues of fact that were raised by the requestor during the public comment period and that are the basis of the hearing request. To facilitate the commission's determination of the number and scope of issues to be referred to hearing, the requestor should, to the extent possible, specify any of the ED's responses to comments that the requestor disputes and the factual basis of the dispute and list any disputed issues of law; and
- 5) provide any other information specified in the public notice of application.

30 TAC § 55.201(d).

**C. Requirement that Requestor be an Affected Person/“Affected Person” Status**

In order to grant a contested case hearing, the Commission must determine that a requestor is an “affected” person. Section 55.203 sets out who may be considered an affected person.

- a) For any application, an affected person is one who has a personal justiciable interest related to a legal right, duty, privilege, power, or economic interest affected by the application. An interest common to members of the general public does not qualify as a personal justiciable interest.
- b) Except as provided by 30 TAC § 55.103, governmental entities, including local governments and public agencies with authority under state law over issues raised by the application may be considered affected persons.
- c) In determining whether a person is an affected person, all factors shall be considered, including, but not limited to, the following:
  - 1) whether the interest claimed is one protected by the law under which the application will be considered;
  - 2) distance restrictions or other limitations imposed by law on the affected interest;
  - 3) whether a reasonable relationship exists between the interest claimed and the activity regulated;
  - 4) likely impact of the regulated activity on the health and safety of the person, and on the use of property of the person;
  - 5) likely impact of the regulated activity on use of the impacted natural resource by the person;
  - 6) whether the requestor timely submitted comments on the application which were not withdrawn; and
  - 7) for governmental entities, their statutory authority over or interest in the issues relevant to the application.
- d) In making affected person determinations, the commission may also consider, to the extent consistent with case law:
  - 1) the merits of the underlying application and supporting documentation in the commission’s administrative record, including whether the application meets the requirements for permit issuance;
  - 2) the analysis and opinions of the executive director; and
  - 3) any other expert reports, affidavits, opinions, or data submitted by the executive director, the applicant, or hearing requestor.

30 TAC § 55.203

## D. Referral to the State Office of Administrative Hearings

“When the commission grants a request for a contested case hearing, the commission shall issue an order specifying the number and scope of the issues referred to SOAH for a hearing.” 30 TAC § 50.115(b). “The commission may not refer an issue to SOAH for a contested case hearing unless the commission determines that the issue:

- 1) involves a disputed question of fact or a mixed question of law and fact;
- 2) was raised during the public comment period, and, for applications filed on or after September 1, 2015, was raised in a comment made by an affected person whose request is granted; and
- 3) is relevant and material to the decision on the application.

30 TAC § 50.115(c).

## V. Analysis of the Requests

### A. Analysis of the Hearing Requests

The Executive Director has analyzed the hearing requests to determine whether they comply with Commission rules, if the requestors qualify as affected persons, what issues may be referred for a contested case hearing, and what is the appropriate length of the hearing.

#### 1. Whether the Requesters Complied With 30 TAC §§ 55.201(c) and (d)

Cook’s Branch Conservancy submitted timely written hearing requests, provided contact information, and requested a contested case hearing. CBC raised disputed issues presented by them during the public comment period that have not been withdrawn.

The ED recommends the Commission find that the hearing request of CBC substantially complies with the requirements of 30 TAC § 55.201(c) and (d).

#### 2. Whether the Requesters Met the Requirements of an Affected Person

##### Cook’s Branch Conservancy

The ED’s satellite map (Attachment A) shows that CBC has property that is adjacent to both the proposed facility and the discharge route and therefore listed on the landowner’s map and list of affected persons (Attachment B). They submitted timely comments that have not been withdrawn. This requester has raised relevant issues regarding water quality and raised a relevant and material issue regarding the potential impact of the discharge on aquatic species in the receiving waters.

This requester has shown how it will be impacted by the proposed facility. Based on the location of its property, it has demonstrated that the facility may affect health, safety, or use of the property or natural resources. The requester has shown how it has standing to request a hearing. 30 TAC § 55.203(c). The requester raises

water quality concerns and has shown a personal justiciable interest related to a legal right, duty, privilege, power, or economic interest affected by the application not common to members of the general public. Considering the factors listed in 55.203 that are used to determine affected person status, the ED concludes that CBC qualifies as an affected person.

The ED recommends the Commission find that CBC is an affected person under the requirements of 30 TAC § 55.203.

## **B. Whether the Issues Raised are Referable to SOAH for a Contested Case Hearing**

The ED analyzed issues raised in the hearing request it has recommended denying in accordance with the regulatory criteria and provided the following recommendations regarding whether the issues can be referred to SOAH if the Commission grants the hearing requests. The issues discussed were raised during the public comment period, are considered disputed, and addressed in the RTC. None of the issues were withdrawn. Under SB 709, only those issues raised in a timely comment by a requester whose request is granted may be referred. The ED has listed the relevant RTC responses and the requestors who raised each issue.

### **1. Whether the draft permit is adequately protective of water quality including the protection of surface water, groundwater, and animals in accordance with applicable regulations including the Texas Surface Water Quality Standards. (RTC Response #9)**

This issue involves a question of fact, was raised during the public comment period, and was not withdrawn. If it can be shown the draft permit would adversely affect water quality in the receiving waters, that information would be relevant and material to a decision on the application. The proposed draft permit was developed in accordance with the TCEQ rules and the TSWQS in 30 TAC 307.5 that require that discharges may not degrade the receiving waters and may not result in situations that impair existing, attainable, or designated uses, and that surface waters not be toxic to aquatic life, terrestrial wildlife, livestock, or domestic animals. In addition, the TCEQ staff performed an antidegradation review in accordance with the June 2010 TCEQ's *Procedures to Implement the Texas Surface Water Quality Standards* (IPs). The ED has determined that the draft permit is in accordance with the TSWQS in 30 TAC Chapter 307. The ED has determined that the draft permit is in accordance with the Texas Surface Water Quality Standards (TSWQS) in 30 TAC Chapter 307 which ensures that the discharge is protective of aquatic life, human health, and the environment.

The ED recommends referring this issue to SOAH if the Commission grants CBC's hearing request.

### **2. Whether the discharge route is correct as described in the application in accordance with 30 TAC § 309.12. (RTC Response #8)**

This issue involves a question of fact, was raised during the public comment period, and was not withdrawn. If it can be shown the discharge route was incorrectly described, that information would be relevant and material to a decision on the application. The original discharge route description was contained in the NORI

published on February 18, 2022: *The discharge route is from the plant site to an unnamed tributary of Lake Creek; thence to East Edge Lake; thence to Lake Creek.* On May 18, 2022, the Applicant published a Combined NORI and Notice of Application and Preliminary Decision (NAPD) in English in the *Conroe Courier* and in Spanish in *La Voz* newspaper. The combined notice was issued to correct the discharge route described in the NORI. *The effluent will be discharged via Outfall 001 to an unnamed tributary, thence to an unnamed impoundment, thence to an unnamed tributary, thence to East Edge Lake, thence to an unnamed tributary, thence to Lake Creek in Segment No. 1015 of the San Jacinto River Basin.*

The ED recommends referring this issue to SOAH if the Commission grants CBC's hearing request.

**3. Whether the proposed discharge is protective of aquatic life in the receiving waters in accordance with applicable regulations including the Texas Surface Water Quality Standards. (RTC Response # 10)**

This issue involves a question of fact, was raised during the public comment period, and was not withdrawn. If it can be shown the draft permit would adversely affect aquatic life in the receiving waters, that information would be relevant and material to a decision on the application. The proposed draft permit was developed in accordance with the TCEQ rules and the TSWQS in 30 TAC 307.5 that require that discharges may not degrade the receiving waters and may not result in situations that impair existing, attainable, or designated uses, and that surface waters not be toxic to aquatic life, terrestrial wildlife, livestock, or domestic animals. In addition, the TCEQ staff performed an antidegradation review in accordance with the June 2010 TCEQ's *Procedures to Implement the Texas Surface Water Quality Standards* (IPs). The ED has determined that the draft permit is in accordance with the TSWQS in 30 TAC Chapter 307 which ensures that the proposed discharge is protective of aquatic life, human health, and the environment.

The ED recommends referring this issue to SOAH if the Commission grants CBC's hearing request.

**4. Whether the TCEQ rules requiring sand mining facilities to comply with specific requirements in 30 TAC Chapter 311 will adequately protect quality of the receiving waters and the species inhabiting them. (RTC Response # 11)**

TPDES permits establish terms and conditions that are intended to provide water quality pollution control. Therefore, the TCEQ's review of an application for a TPDES permit focuses on controlling the discharge of pollutants into water in the state. The protectiveness of other TCEQ rules that may apply to the facility are not relevant to the Commission's evaluation of a TPDES permit application. Therefore, that information would not be relevant and material to a decision on the application.

The ED recommends not referring this issue to SOAH if the Commission grants CBC's hearing request.

## **VI. Duration of the Contested Case Hearing**

The ED recommends a duration of 180 days for a contested case hearing on this matter, should there be one, between preliminary hearing and the presentation of a



proposal for decision to the Commission.

## VII. Executive Director's Recommendation

The ED recommends the following actions by the Commission:


1. The ED recommends that the Commission grant the hearing request of CBC.
2. If the Commission finds that CBC is an affected person and grants its hearing requests, the ED recommends that Issue Nos. 1, 2, and 3 be referred to SOAH for a proceeding with a duration of 180 days.
3. If the Commission finds that CBC is an affected person and grants its hearing request, the ED recommends that the Commission order concurrent mediation between them and the Applicant.

Respectfully submitted,

TEXAS COMMISSION ON  
ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

Erin Chancellor  
Acting Executive Director

Guy Henry, Acting Deputy Director  
Environmental Law Division

By 

Celia Castro, Staff Attorney  
Environmental Law Division  
State Bar No. 03997350  
P.O. Box 13087, MC-173  
Austin, Texas 78711-3087  
(512) 239-5692  
(512) 239-0626 (Fax)  
REPRESENTING THE EXECUTIVE  
DIRECTOR OF THE TEXAS COMMISSION  
ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I certify that on June 2, 2023, the “Executive Director’s Response to Hearing Requests” for MTX Materials, LP, TPDES Permit No. WQ0005337000, was filed with the TCEQ’s Office of the Chief Clerk and a complete copy was served to all persons listed on the attached mailing list via hand delivery, facsimile transmission, electronic transmission, inter- agency mail, or by deposit in the U.S. Mail.



---

Celia Castro, Staff Attorney  
Environmental Law Division  
State Bar No. 03997350

MAILING LIST  
MTX Materials, LP  
TCEQ Docket No. 2023-0555-IWD; Permit No. WQ0005337000

FOR THE APPLICANT:

Marc Deer, Owner  
MTX Materials, LP  
7720 Westview Drive  
Houston, Texas 77055

Cole Gorka, President of Sales  
MTX Materials, LP  
19219 Keenan Cut Off Road  
Montgomery, Texas 77316

Paige Baker, Environmental Scientist  
ESE Partners, LLC  
2002 West Grand Parkway North,  
Suite 140  
Katy, Texas 77449

FOR THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

via electronic mail:

Celia Castro, Staff Attorney  
Texas Commission on Environmental  
Quality  
Environmental Law Division, MC-173  
P.O. Box 13087  
Austin, Texas 78711

Ruiqiang Zong, Technical Staff  
Texas Commission on Environmental  
Quality  
Water Quality Division, MC-148  
P.O. Box 13087  
Austin, Texas 78711

Ryan Vise, Deputy Director  
Texas Commission on Environmental  
Quality  
External Relations Division  
Public Education Program, MC-108  
P.O. Box 13087  
Austin, Texas 78711

FOR ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION

via electronic mail:

Kyle Lucas  
Texas Commission on Environmental  
Quality  
Alternative Dispute Resolution, MC-222  
P.O. Box 13087  
Austin, Texas 78711

FOR PUBLIC INTEREST COUNSEL

via electronic mail:

Garrett T. Arthur, Attorney  
Texas Commission on Environmental  
Quality  
Public Interest Counsel, MC-103  
P.O. Box 13087  
Austin, Texas 78711

FOR THE CHIEF CLERK

via eFilings:

Docket Clerk  
Texas Commission on Environmental  
Quality  
Office of Chief Clerk, MC-105  
P.O. Box 13087  
Austin, Texas 78711

REQUESTER(S):

Jeffery Mundy  
The Mundy Firm PLLC  
4131 Spicewood Springs Road  
Suite O-3  
Austin, Texas 78759

INTERESTED PERSON(S):

Daniel Timothy Bolton  
8072 Stacy Diane Drive  
Montgomery, Texas 77316

Joe Hamrick  
P.O. Box 6482  
Huntsville, Texas 77342

Michael Machala  
8166 Hills Parkway  
Montgomery, Texas 77316

# Attachment A


# MTX Materials, LP WQ0005337000

Map Requested by TCEQ Office of Legal Services  
for Commissioners' Agenda




*Protecting Texas by  
Reducing and  
Preventing Pollution*

Texas Commission on Environmental Quality  
GIS Team (Mail Code 197)  
P.O. Box 13087  
Austin, Texas 78711-3087  
Date: 1/13/2023  
CRF 0082004  
Cartographer: jbartlin



- Facility Outfall
- Facility Boundary
- Requestor Property
- 1 Mile Discharge
- 0.5 Mile Radius
- 1.0 Mile Radius
- 1.5 Mile Radius

Requestor:  
Cooks Branch  
Conservancy LP







The facility is located in Montgomery County. The circle (green) in the left inset map represents the approximate location of the facility. The inset map on the right represents the location of Montgomery County (red) in the state of Texas.

Source: The location of the facility was provided by the TCEQ Office of Legal Services (OLS). OLS obtained the site location information from the applicant and the requestor information from the requestor.

This map was generated by the Information Resources Division of the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality. This product is for informational purposes and may not have been prepared for or be suitable for legal, engineering, or surveying purposes. It does not represent an on-the-ground survey and represents only the approximate relative location of property boundaries. For more information concerning this map, contact the Information Resource Division at (512) 239-0800.

# Attachment B

**LEGEND**

-  Outfalls
-  Discharge Route
-  Properties Owned by MTX Materials, L.P.
-  Facility Boundary




MTX MATERIALS, LP  
 APPROXIMATELY 131 ACRES  
 19291 KEENAN CUT OFF ROAD  
 MONTGOMERY, TEXAS 77316

**AFFECTED LANDOWNERS MAP**

PROJECT NUMBER: 21-0366  
 FILE NAME: Attachment C - Affected Landowners Map V2  
 DATE: 1/11/2022  
 DRAWN BY: PB  
 APPROVED BY: VS



**ATTACHMENT C**



Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS IGN, and the GIS User Community

ID	MCAD Property ID	Owner Name	Mailing Address	City	State	Zip
A1	R97466	MCDONALD, LAURE LEE	20983 WESTGROVE LN	PORTER	TX	77365
A2	R97471	WILLIAMS, FARON RAY	9609 ELOISE DR	MONTGOMERY	TX	77316
A3	R97477	PATTON, CHARLES W	6615 GRANDVALE DR	HOUSTON	TX	77072
A4	R97480	KOWIS, DIANA	17515 QUEENSLAKE DR	CYPRESS	TX	77429
A5	R97484	TORRES, ROBERT E	9580 RED WING LN	MONTGOMERY	TX	77316
A6	N/A - PUBLIC ROAD	NOT APPLICABLE	NOT APPLICABLE	NOT APPLICABLE	N/A	NOT APPLICABLE
A7	R97488	YOUNG, JAMES M & HOLLY M	9585 RED WING LN	MONTGOMERY	TX	77316
A8	R97494	BARANOWSKI, JOHN E	19103 CLARK ST	CONROE	TX	77302
A9	R97499	BARANOWSKI, JOHN E	19103 CLARK ST	CONROE	TX	77302
A10	N/A - PUBLIC ROAD	NOT APPLICABLE	NOT APPLICABLE	NOT APPLICABLE	N/A	NOT APPLICABLE
A11	R97501	MING, BARTON P & RACHEL A	9633 SEALE RD	MONTGOMERY	TX	77316
A12	R97502	RODRIGUEZ, MANUEL A	9621 SEALE LN	MONTGOMERY	TX	77316
A13	R97500	VILLA, MANUEL & PATRICIA	9565 SEALE	MONTGOMERY	TX	77316
A14	N/A - PUBLIC ROAD	NOT APPLICABLE	NOT APPLICABLE	NOT APPLICABLE	N/A	NOT APPLICABLE
A15	R97515	CLARK, WYNONA S	10072 CRESENT DR	MONTGOMERY	TX	77316
A16	R97516	CLARK, WYNONA S	10072 CRESENT DR	MONTGOMERY	TX	77316
A17	R97517	PATTERSON, PAMELA D	9199 PEGGY DR	MONTGOMERY	TX	77316
A18	R97505	PATTERSON, PAMELA D	9199 PEGGY DR	MONTGOMERY	TX	77316
A19	R97503	FONSECA, MONICA	18563 MICHALS RUN	MONTGOMERY	TX	77316
A20	R490128	FONSECA, MONICA	123 RACETRACK LN	MONTGOMERY	TX	77356
A21	R263454	OWEN, MONTY L & BLYNDA S	19287 KEENAN CUT OFF RD	MONTGOMERY	TX	77316
A22	R275267	BILDERBACK, DAMON & DAYNA A	18766 DALTON WILLIS DR	MONTGOMERY	TX	77316
A23	R275268	DENISON, SHAWN M & KELLY D	18769 DALTON WILLIS DR	MONTGOMERY	TX	77316
A24	R275269	WARREN, DUANE E & MONICA T	18761 DALTON WILLIS DR	MONTGOMERY	TX	77316
A25	R275274	PRZYBORSKI, CRAIG A & EMILY A	8064 STACY DIANE DR	MONTGOMERY	TX	77316
A26	R275275	BOLTON, DANIEL & DIANE	8072 STACY DIANE DR	MONTGOMERY	TX	77316
A27	R275277	BROCK, MIKE	28075 FM 2978	MAGNOLIA	TX	77354
A28	R39105	COOKS BRANCH CONSERVANCY LP	2700 TECHNOLOGY FOREST BLVD	SPRING	TX	77381
A29	R258914	SCHROEDER, ROBERT & KATHY	8134 HILLS PKWY	MONTGOMERY	TX	77316
A30	R264062	MICHAEL MACHALA LIVING TRUST	8166 HILLS PARKWAY	MONTGOMERY	TX	77316
A31	R264063	DRIVER, SHANNON W & JENNIFER LYN	8174 HILLS PKWY	MONTGOMERY	TX	77316
A32	R264068	REED, ROBERT H JR & THERESA L	8214 HILLS PKWY	MONTGOMERY	TX	77316
A33	R264069	HALL, CHARLES E & CHRISTY L	8222 HILLS PKWY	MONTGOMERY	TX	77316
A34	R264074	REEDER, LOY D & APRIL E	8262 HILLS PKWY	MONTGOMERY	TX	77316
A35	R264076	DIEHL, WILLIAM T & RACHELLE	8278 HILLS PKWY	MONTGOMERY	TX	77316
A36	R264111	THE HILLS OF MONTGOMERY POA INC	PO BOX 425	MONTGOMERY	TX	77356
A37	R264077	UNKNOWN	UNKNOWN	UNKNOWN	UNKNOWN	UNKNOWN
A38	R264078	UNKNOWN	UNKNOWN	UNKNOWN	UNKNOWN	UNKNOWN
A39	R46073	COOKS BRANCH CONSERVANCY LP	2700 TECHNOLOGY FOREST BLVD	SPRING	TX	77381
A40	R44686	COOKS BRANCH CONSERVANCY LP	2700 TECHNOLOGY FOREST BLVD	SPRING	TX	77381
A41	R309117	HUTSON, KATHERINE M	8280 FM 149 RD	MONTGOMERY	TX	77316
A42	R309117	HUTSON, KATHERINE M	8280 FM 149 RD	MONTGOMERY	TX	77316
A43	R97572	SEIP, ROBERTA	10123 REBECCA LN	MONTGOMERY	TX	77316
A44	R97571	UNKNOWN	UNKNOWN	UNKNOWN	UNKNOWN	UNKNOWN
A45	R97570	SEIP, JIMMY & KIMBERLEY	10147 REBECCA LN	MONTGOMERY	TX	77316
A46	R97569	JOHNSON, GALE L & DEBRA K	10027 REBECCA LN	MONTGOMERY	TX	77316
A47	R97568	NOORDHOEK, KATHY	9955 REBECCA LN	MONTGOMERY	TX	77316
A48	R97566	PAVLICEK, JASON ALEX	9927 REBECCA LN	MONTGOMERY	TX	77316
A49	R97565	WREN, ANTHONY & DANA	9873 REBECCA LN	MONTGOMERY	TX	77316
A50	R97564	SMITH, BERNICE H-ESTATE OF	9861 REBECCA LN	MONTGOMERY	TX	77316
A51	R97563	PATTON, PAUL & GIDGET	9793 REBECCA LN	MONTGOMERY	TX	77316
A52	R97562	MCDOWELL, PAUL WELDON	PO BOX 3977	HUMBLE	TX	77347
A53	R97548	PATTON, PAUL & GIDGET	9793 REBECCA LN	MONTGOMERY	TX	77316
A54	R97463	BRENHAM, JAMES W	9318 MEADOWGLEN LN	HOUSTON	TX	77063
A55	N/A - PUBLIC ROAD	NOT APPLICABLE	NOT APPLICABLE	NOT APPLICABLE	N/A	NOT APPLICABLE
A56	N/A - PUBLIC ROAD	NOT APPLICABLE	NOT APPLICABLE	NOT APPLICABLE	N/A	NOT APPLICABLE